

Radical Abolitionist.

"PROCLAIM LIBERTY THROUGHOUT ALL THE LAND, UNTO ALL THE INHABITANTS THEREOF."—LEV. xxv. 10.

VOLUME III.]

NEW YORK, AUGUST, 1857.

[NUMBER 1.

The Radical Abolitionist

WILLIAM GOODELL, Editor.

Is Published Monthly,

AT 48 BEEKMAN STREET, NEW YORK.

BY THE AMERICAN ABOLITION SOCIETY.

TERMS.

PER ANNUM, OR FOR TWELVE NUMBERS.

SINGLE COPIES.....	\$0.50
FIVE COPIES directed to one person.....	2.00
EIGHT COPIES, do. do.	3.00
FOURTEEN COPIES, do. do.	5.00
THIRTY COPIES, do. do.	10.00

Payments in advance.

TO CHRISTIAN ABOLITIONISTS.

We have a word to say to Christian abolitionists, or, (if another name be preferred,) to Christian Anti-Slavery men.

We have indeed met with the statement that *all* abolitionists are Christians, so that the adjective 'Christian' prefixed to 'abolitionists,' is said to be superfluous and unmeaning. But we know of some who claim to be abolitionists who would disclaim the name of Christian.—There are Jews, Mahometans, Deists, and Atheists, who have sense and honesty enough to oppose chattel slavery, and we will not deny their right to call themselves abolitionists, or anti-slavery men. So, too, there are many, who, while they assent to the truthfulness of the Scriptures and the divine origin and excellence of Christianity, do not consider *themselves* Christians in the high, spiritual sense of the term, while they are nevertheless abolitionists, or anti-slavery men, and would feel themselves injured were they otherwise classified.—In distinction from these classes, there are abolitionists and anti-slavery men who are *Christians*, who profess to be such, and are recognized as such, by Christians and by abolitionists among whom they dwell, and to whom they are known. *It is to such* that we have a special message at this time, which belongs more fully to *them* than to abolitionists in general.

We address you, then, as Christian brethren. Some of you are ministers of the gospel, and some of you are Editors of religious newspapers, and preach and write against Slavery, as we also do.—But there is *one* point which we wish to press upon your attention, because we are apprehensive that large numbers of you have fallen into a grave error in respect to it, which not only prevents the abolition of slavery, but also mars your religious faith, obscures the light of your Christian profession, and dishonors the cause of Christ, which is so dear to you.

Not a few of you, if we mistake not, have been led to deny that God requires of our Na-

tional Government, the Abolition of American Slavery.

Not a few of you, who are religious teachers and editors, if we mistake not, have assumed this position. While you oppose the extension of slavery into new Territory, by the exercise of your political power, as citizens, you refuse or neglect to exercise that same power for the abolition of slavery in the States where it already exists. You would exert a persuasive moral influence against it, as you would against slavery in some foreign land. But politically, and as American citizens, you would let it alone, or not vote to abolish it.

There are two distinct grounds upon which you would do this: *First*, some of you say that you have no political power, under the Constitution of your country, to overthrow slavery in the slave States.—*Second*, some of you, when shown your mistake in this matter, and when you can no longer deny that the Constitution clearly confers the power, (or, perhaps, when you prefer to cease urging the objection in that shape,) declare, openly, that you do not think that the Constitution *ought* to convey such power. There are some of you who say, that if the Constitution were to be made over again, you would not consent that it should contain or convey any such power. You say it would be subversive of "State Rights"—that it would be a dangerous stretch of National power, that it would be "centralization" and "consolidation" which the States ought not to permit, if the National Government should protect all the people of America from enslavement. No less than five leading religious Anti-Slavery newspapers are understood to have taken that ground, recently.

Now, brethren, we cannot forbear entreating you to review your position in the light of God's word. The points to which we would respectfully direct your attention are the following.

1. *National Responsibilities.* Do not the Scriptures teach that God holds nations, as such, the people and their rulers, responsible for the oppressions, the violence, the outrages, the robbery, the persecution, the violations of human rights prevailing in the nation and unprohibited by penal laws, whether those wrongs are perpetrated by individuals, municipal authorities, or by the government itself, or its officials?—Is not civil Government, however constituted and organized, an ordinance of God, for protection from such wrongs?—Is not the affirmative of this taught in the Scriptures, by the prophets, and by the inspired records of God's providential and retributive government over the nations? Is not this the burden of God's messages to Egypt, to Israel,

to Judah, to Assyria, to Babylon, to Tyre, and other ancient nations and cities? And is not this the lesson of their subsequent histories? Does not the New Testament teach the same?

2. Is not American Slavery one of our great national sins? Is it not identical with oppression, with violence, with outrage, with robbery with persecution, with the violation of human rights? And does it not, whether considered in the aggregate, or in the detail, come directly within the category of those national sins which nations and national governments are required in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, to prohibit, to suppress, and to remove? If not, what sins are national sins? And what are those national sins which God, in the holy Scriptures, requires national governments to prohibit and to suppress? For what purposes has God, according to the teachings of the Scriptures, ordained civil government, if not for this? When did God ever release or excuse a Nation, or a National Government from the discharge of this duty? Or what Nation or National Government ever neglected it without incurring the divine displeasure? Can either sacred or secular history furnish the instance?

3. Is it credible, in the light of God's Word, that any modern communities, nations, and their rulers, can so construct their Governments, can so limit their several powers, can so apportion, divide, sub-divide, arrange and complicate their responsibilities, between the Nation and the several parts of the Nation, and between the Government and the people, that the Nation, as such, and its National Government, can transfer, throw off, and get rid of, the responsibilities and duties already described, and which God, in the Scriptures, has hitherto committed without exception, to all other Nations and all other National Governments, in all countries and in all ages—and for which the righteous dispensations of his Providential Government has hitherto held them responsible?—Can man, by his institutions, so completely change and annihilate divine institutions? Can you thus think, and yet continue to hold to the subordination of human Governments to God's "higher law"?

4. Can you, on a studious and prayerful consideration of these questions, continue to disbelieve and deny that God holds *this* Nation and its National Government responsible for American Slavery, and that it is their solemn duty to abolish it?

On what doctrine, precept, principle, prophecy, or historical record of the Scriptures can you lean for any support, in such a denial? I do not ask of you what maxims, pleas, subterfuges, and expedients might be proposed or resorted

RADICAL ABOLITIONIST.

to by worldly politicians, who never think of making God's word the rule of their political and legislative action. But I ask of you as Christians, Christian Ministers, and Christian Editors, how this Nation and its Government can tolerate American slavery and be blameless? Is it not a National sin? Is not the Nation responsible for it? Is not the nation bound to remove it? "To the law and to the testimony." "What hath God spoken" in relation to such subjects?

Do not the people of the United States constitute one nation? Is not their nationality their boast? Do they not cherish that nationality so excessively that, for fear of disturbing it, they refuse to put away this national sin? Have they not a National Government, wielding National powers? How, then, can they escape national responsibilities?

Will it be said that the Nation must not protect all the people of the Nation, lest it should offend "State Sovereignty," and infringe "State Rights"? Does the Bible allow us to recognize any such State Sovereignty and State rights as the sovereign right to make merchandize of men's souls?

Will it be said that our National Government has no authority to do what God requires all other National governments to do? How could the Nation establish a National Government, and put into its hands the national sword, the national purse, the national archives, the national seals, without committing to it the responsibilities of the nation? Or can the nation divest itself of the responsibilities which the God of Nature and of the Scriptures has made and declared to be inseparable from national existence?

Will it be said that such 'centralized' and 'consolidated' power in the hands of the national Government would be dangerous to the rights of the States and of the people? Did the God of the Bible think so, when he clothed all the ancient national Governments with that same power, and when he required of them the exercise of that power—"to execute judgment"—to 'proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof'? Wherein is it more dangerous for a national Government to have this power than for a State Government to have it? Can it be dangerous for a Government to have power to protect the rights of its subjects as God commands it to do? What is the testimony of our own experience on this point? Our national Government has long disclaimed the authority to afford such protection and has refused the exercise of such authority. But has it, by that habit, learned to respect 'State rights' or the rights of the people?—Does the Bible warrant any such notions of 'Consolidation' and 'State Rights'?

Will it be said that because the *States* and the State Governments are bound to afford this protection, therefore the *Nation* and the National Government have no such responsibility? What foundation is there either in reason or Scripture, for such a conclusion? When God required the city of Babylon to execute justice, did he therefore release from that responsibility, the nation, the Chaldean Empire, to which Babylon belonged? When Samaria and Jerusalem were punished for their oppressions, did God spare Israel and Judah? When

the tribe of Benjamin tolerated lawless outrages, did God allow the surrounding tribes to stand aloof, lest they should infringe 'State rights' and be guilty of impudent interference? When did the God of the Bible allow one part of a nation or the national Government to fold its hands, when another part of the same nation was infested with robbers, whose atrocities they were able to suppress?

Will it be said that the peculiarities of our Constitution, tie up our hands? The question returns, *whose* Constitution is to be paramount, the people's? or God's? (I need not say that the Constitution, when expounded on *this* subject, by the same just legal rules applied by the courts, to all *other* subjects, is susceptible of no such construction.)

No fear of consolidation has ever yet restrained any American citizen from employing to reclaim his own rights of property, the same powers of the national Government with which we ask you to recover the lost liberties of the enslaved! The question is, whether a God of impartial justice, the God of the Bible, will accept of excuses like these? Read *that* question by the light of Sinai—go with it to Gethsemane—take it up to the cross of Calvary—bear it onward to the judgment seat of Christ as described in the 25th chapter of Matthew, then look into eternity, and decide.

Here are four millions of precious souls, for whom the earth was builded and for whom Christ died. They were placed in this land of Bibles, and Sabbaths, and Sanctuaries, and Family Sanctities, that they might read, hear and learn the way of Salvation, and be trained for heaven. They were ignorant but you were learned. They were placed here in a nation of which you and your fellow Christians are part. You are clothed with a share of the nation's power. You are a part of the Sovereign people. Yours is the National Government. You are yourselves, with myself, and every other citizen, a part of the Nation and of the Government to whom God, in his holy Word says—(*does he not?*) 'Break every yoke.' 'Let the oppressed go free.' 'Proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all inhabitants thereof.' 'Deliver him that is spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor, lest my fury go forth, like fire, and burn that there be none to quench it, because of the evil of your doings.'—But the work, delayed for two centuries, is not yet done!—You see the slaves despoiled of their rights, embruted, robbed, naked, hungry, athirst, sick, and in prison.—You hear a voice—'Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of the least of these, ye did it unto me.'—You see them heathenised, denied the light of the Bible, deprived of family sanctities, herded together like brute beasts.—You feel impelled to plead their cause.—You *do* plead for them, till the Nation hears and begins to be alarmed. Retributive judgments are beginning to fall upon us, as a nation—the alarm increases—and a feeble few attempt to repeat God's message to the nation—'Break every yoke.'—Had they not a right to expect your assistance in swelling the cry? To whom should they look for aid but to the Christians, the Christian Ministers, the Christian Editors, the Christian Abolitionists, the Christian Anti-Slavery men of the land? Whatever may have been charged upon others,

you are not charged with being 'infidel abolitionists.' *You* are not 'non-government' abolitionists. *You* do not reject the Bible as a rule of faith and practice. *You* do not intend to appeal from the Bible to human wisdom, in shaping your Anti-Slavery measures. *You* do not intend to reject divine institutions, in favor of human devices and contrivances. Ought you not, then, to advocate such anti-slavery measures as are in accordance with God's word? And can you do this, without advocating a national abolition of slavery? Can the national sin be removed without national repentance? Can there be acceptable repentance without fruits meet for repentance? Or, how can there be such fruits without a national liberation of the *enslaved*? Whatever you do to these, the least of his brethren, you do to Christ. Whatever you do to them, in this matter, you refuse to *him*. When *He*, in their persons, calls for liberation, will you refuse him, in deference to 'State Rights'? When *He* demands at the hands of this nation, the purchase of his blood, on Calvary, when *He* demands their protected rights of religious freedom, their right to his holy word, their right to the sacred family relation, their right to the knowledge of his will, of his love, and of his Salvation—will *you*, Christian ministers, Christian editors, Christian abolitionists, Christian anti-slavery men—will *you*, as American citizens, members of the State Governments and members of the National Government, stand up and urge the objection that you cannot do it, for fear of 'Consolidation,' for fear of infringing 'State rights'?

Think well of these things I beseech you. A solemn weight of responsibility rests on your shoulders. The divine patience with this ungodly nation is well nigh exhausted. A far lighter weight than yours, might turn the scale, as ten would have saved Sodom.—Sad indeed, would it be, if the influence of Christians, anti-slavery Christians, Ministers, and Editors, should bolster up this guilty nation, in her impenitency, till her destruction is sealed. The religion you profess and teach, forbids men to expect salvation without repentance.—Why should you forget this? Why should you forget that the salvation of communities, as well as of individuals is conditioned upon repentance, and fruits meet for repentance?

A LECTURE FROM THE SOUTH.

We have often predicted that whenever the non-slaveholders of the South should wake up to their true interests, and take hold of the slavery question in earnest, they would feel the need of Northern assistance, and that neither Free Soilism nor Disunion would answer their purpose.

We find a verification of our prediction in Mr. Helper's new book, 'The Impending Crisis of the South.' The passage had not met our eye when we noticed the work in our last number. We trust the appeal will not be lost upon the thousands and tens of thousands, of Free Soilers and Republicans who will be attracted to the book by the very favorable notice of it in the New York Tribune. Such a book, with such a commendation, is among the encouraging signs of the times.—But, to our extract—

"Were we simply a freesoil, or anything

else less than a thorough and uncompromising abolitionist, we should certainly tax our ability to the utmost to get up a cogent argument against the extension of slavery over any part of our domain where it does not now exist; but as our principles are hostile to the institution even where it does exist, and, therefore, by implication and in fact, more hostile still to its introduction into new territory, we forbear the preparation of any special remarks on this particular subject.

"With regard to the unnatural and demoralizing institution of slavery, we believe the majority of Northern people are too scrupulous. They seem to think that it is enough for them to be mere freesoilers, to keep in check the difusive element of slavery, and to prevent it from crossing over the bounds within which it is now regulated by municipal law. Remiss in their *national* duties, as we contend, they make no positive attack upon the institution in the Southern States. Only a short time since, one of their ablest journals—the *North American and United States Gazette*, published in Philadelphia—made use of the following language:—

"With slavery in the States we make no pretence of having anything politically to do. For better or for worse, the system belongs solely to the people of those States; and is separated by an impassable gulf of State sovereignty from any legal intervention of ours. We cannot vote it down any more than we can vote down the institution of caste in Hindostan, or abolish polygamy in the Sultan's dominions. Thus, precluded from all political action in reference to it, prevented from touching one stone of the edifice, nor the slightest responsibility attaches to us as citizens for its continued existence. But on the question of extending slavery over the free Territories of the United States, it is our right, it is our imperative duty to think, to feel, to speak and to vote. We cannot interfere to cover the shadows of slavery with the sunshine of freedom, but we can interfere to prevent the sunshine of freedom from being eclipsed by the shadows of slavery. We can interpose to stay the progress of that institution, which aims to derive free labor from its own heritage. Kansas should be divided up into countless homes for the ownership of men who have a right to the fruit of their own labors. Free labor would make it bud and blossom like the rose; would cover it with beauty, and draw from it boundless wealth; would throng it with population; would make States, nations, empires out of it, prosperous, powerful, intelligent and free, illustrating on a wide theatre the beneficent ends of Providence in the formation of our government, to advance and elevate the millions of our race, and, like the heart in the body, from its central position, sending out on every side, far and near, the vital influences of freedom and civilisation. May that region, therefore, be secured to free labor!"

"Now we fully and heartily indorse every line of the latter part of this extract; but, with all due deference to our sage contemporary, we do most emphatically dissent from the sentiments embodied in the first part. Pray, permit us to ask—have the people of the North no interest in the United States as a *nation*, and do they not see that slavery is a great injury and disgrace to the *whole country*? Did they not, in 'the days that tried men's souls,' strike as hard blows to secure the independence of Georgia as they did in defending the liberties of Massachusetts, and is it not notoriously true that the Toryism of South Carolina prolonged the war two years at least? Is it not, moreover, equally true that the oligarchies of South Carolina have been unmitigated pests and bores to the General Government ever since it was organized, and that the free and conscientious people of the North are virtually excluded from her soil, in consequence of slavery? It is a well-known and incontestable fact that the Northern States furnished about two-thirds of the American troops engaged in the Revolutionary War,

and, though they were neither more nor less brave or patriotic than their fellow-soldiers of the South, yet, inasmuch as the independence of our country was mainly secured by virtue of their numerical strength, we think they ought to consider it not only their right but their *duty* to make a firm and decisive effort to save the States which they fought to free, from falling under the yoke of a worse tyranny than that which overshadowed them under the reign of King George the Third. Freemen of the North! we earnestly entreat you to think of those things. Hitherto, as mere freesoilers, you have approached but half-way to the line of your duty; now, for your own sake and for ours, and for the purpose of perpetuating this glorious Republic, which your fathers and our fathers founded in septennial streams of blood, we ask you, in all seriousness, to organize yourselves as *one man* under the banners of Liberty, and to aid us in *exterminating* slavery, which is the only thing that militates against our complete aggrandizement as a nation."

STATE SOVEREIGNS WHO CAN BE ENSLAVED!

The 'peculiar institution'—it must be confessed, has some very peculiar things about it, and some that cannot very easily be explained.

The slave States, as we have all been taught, are remarkable for being 'Sovereign' States. So 'sovereign' are they, that 'the United States cannot guaranty to them a Republican form of Government,' as 'the supreme law of the land' enjoins. And they can nullify any Federal enactments whenever they please. Being sovereign States, the people of whom the States are composed, are, of course, 'sovereigns.' And no small swell and dash do these 'sovereigns' make, swaggering about, and dictating, to all the nation besides, what must be done, and what must not be done, or else the said 'sovereigns' will abdicate the thrones of their sovereignty, and stalk out of 'the Union.' So 'sovereign' are they that they can monopolize all the benefits of the National Government without regarding its authority.

But let us analyze that peculiar type of sovereignty, and see what is the stuff of which it is made.

The 'sovereign State' has power, it is claimed, to reduce the people to chattels personal. In that prerogative does its peculiar sovereignty mainly consist. Take away from a slave State that power, and it would have no 'State Sovereignty' left, at all, and the citizens would have none.—So we are told—are told that if the National Government should protect its own citizens, (being citizen also of the States) from chattelhood, it would be a fatal onslaught upon 'State Sovereignty' and 'State rights'—the rights of the 'sovereign' people of the States. Any thing like the enjoyment of National protection from chattelhood would divest them of their sovereignty, at once, and forever. It would be a degradation not to be borne, for a moment.

Well, then, how is it with them in regard to their relations to the 'Sovereign States' to which they belong, and in which they so much glory? What sort of protection have they from the States?—The peculiar 'sovereignty' claimed by and for these slave States is, that they have the 'sovereign' power and right to enslave their own inhabitants. If they can enslave one, they can enslave another, they can enslave all. The 'sovereign' power is without

limitation in respect to race, or color, or numbers. It is commonly held, now, and openly avowed, among the leading and prominent champions of this slaveholding State 'sovereignty, and 'State rights' that the sovereign right includes the right of enslaving *white* men as well as *black* men—'the laboring population, bleached or unbleached,' as Gov. McDuffie, expressed it—anybody, in fact, whom the 'Sovereign State' deems incompetent to take care of themselves. Any man who falls into poverty, or who is obliged to work for a living, in the employ of another, is liable to be enslaved, if the 'sovereign State' so determines. To deny this, would be to preach abolition, of the most radical type, by denying that the 'sovereign' States have any right to enslave human beings.

It comes then to this, that these State sovereigns, with all their swell and swagger, have no protection from chattel slavery, themselves, and in this very fact does the essence of their peculiar sovereignty consist. Their own States, of whose 'sovereignty' they so much boast and glory, and in which they participate, has the 'sovereign' power to make slaves of as many of them as it pleases.—And from this, the National Government cannot protect them, because it would be an invasion of 'sovereignty'—an infraction of their 'State rights.' So that they are without any assurance of either State or National protection. And so far are they from regarding this condition as a calamity, they cherish it as the badge of their peculiar sovereignty and supremacy.—The right of enslaving involves the liability to be enslaved.—And the Government, whether State or national, that cannot protect a man's right to himself, cannot protect any of the rest of his rights.

From all this, it would seem to follow that our swaggering State 'sovereigns' who claim the sovereign right of depriving their fellow-men, of the benefits of protecting law, are, in reality, denying their own right to such protection, and are operating upon a principle incompatible with any protection, to any body. Is this the reason why they, so generally, demean themselves as though they were strangers, alike, to the restraints and to the protection of law, and depended, each for himself, upon his own dirk, revolver, and bowie knife?

Who, or what, 'the State' is, that has the 'sovereign' power to chattelize any or every man, woman, child, in the State, is a puzzle, which has, hitherto, defied our feeble powers of solution. Does the 'State' consist in the Governor, the other State officers, the Legislature, and the judges? But who created these offices, and who filled them? Who gave them power to chattelize any body, or to authorize their being chattelized? Provided the thing could be done, who did it? When, where, and how was it ever done? In which of the Constitutions of any slave State was the power ever conferred?—Or do the slaveholders constitute the State? Who constituted them? Who invested them with the 'sovereignty' of which they are so boastful?

If the 'State' is composed of human beings, black or white, and if it has 'sovereign' power to authorize the enslavement of human beings, black or white, then it has power to authorize its own transformation to chattels—a sort of 'sovereignty' not very much to be desired, or of which to be boastful.

Radical Abolitionist.

NEW YORK, AUGUST, 1857.

LETTERS for the Editor of the Radical Abolitionist, or the Treasurer of the American Abolition Society, should be addressed to them at the Post office box No. 1212, No. 48 Beekman st., New York. We shall then get them without the delay and extra charge of two cents for delivery by the penny post.

TAKE NOTICE, that we do not make any charges for papers sent to those who have not ordered or subscribed for them.

OUR ANNUAL MEETING,
IN THE AUTUMN.

IT will be remembered that the Annual Meeting of the AMERICAN ABOLITION SOCIETY, for the Election of Officers, takes place in the Autumn. The time and place will be announced in due season.

The Committee are desirous of selecting the best time and place, and will gladly receive the suggestions of friends.

It is designed to make that meeting

A GENERAL RALLY

of the advocates of a *National Abolition of Slavery*, to devise ways and means for an agitation of the subject on a larger scale.

This will answer instead of the proposed Convention in June, which was deferred. As the general voice seemed not in favor of a *nominating* Convention, this year, we trust there will be a large meeting to provide for a more general diffusion of needed light and information, preparatory to political action in future.

"OUR NATIONAL CHARTERS."

PRICE REDUCED!—Our Committee have concluded to offer "Our National Charters" at twelve cents retail, or fifteen cents, postage paid. At wholesale, \$6 per hundred, at the purchaser's expense of conveyance.

No one need be ignorant of the Constitution and other national charters, at this price. It is a shame that *the people* should, so generally, be destitute of a copy of the great National Charters of their country, comprising (1) "The Constitution of the United States," 1789; (2) "The Articles of Confederation," 1778; (3) "The Declaration of Independence," 1776; (4) "The Articles of Association," 1774.

This edition contains copious notes on the preceding, showing their relation to slavery, and the relative powers of the State and National Governments. Also, in an Appendix, Extracts from our early State Constitutions, Ordinance of 1787, and Testimonies of our Revolutionary Fathers, &c.

The whole, comprises not only the Constitution itself, and other national charters entire, with a commentary upon them, but also a synopsis of the "*legal rules of interpretation*," as laid down by our principal jurists, and by the Supreme Court of the United States. It also constitutes a condensed and authentic documentary history of the Federal Constitution, as embraced in the previous charters, and in the matter contained in the Appendix.

Will not our friends take measures for ob-

taining a supply for their respective neighborhoods?

GREAT MOVEMENT IN WISCONSIN.

NO LAW FOR SLAVERY.—NO SLAVE HUNTS IN SLAVE STATES.

Wisconsin is taking the lead. Our readers remember the prosecution, imprisonment, and fining of S. M. Booth, Editor of the Wisconsin Free Democrat, at Milwaukee, for the alleged crime of harboring a fugitive slave. They remember, too, the decision of the Supreme Court of Wisconsin, declaring the Fugitive Slave bill, unconstitutional, and the consequent interposition of the State Officers, to prevent the seizure and sale of Mr. Booth's press and printing apparatus by the United States Marshals.—This was a good beginning, and is leading to something still better—the rally of the friends of liberty in Wisconsin, upon the radical doctrine of 'No law for slavery'—'No slave hunts in free States.'

An Anti-Slavery Convention was held at Milwaukee, June 17th which GERRIT SMITH, by special invitation, attended, and made a speech in which he argued the Constitutional question, with great force, denying the Constitutional right of the slave States to maintain slavery, exposing the fallacies of the New York Independent, the National Era, and even (at times) of the New York Tribune on this subject, not omitting to mention the Liberator and the N. A. S. Standard, thus preparing the way for affirming that 'slavery is not merely a State affair'—that 'the nation is responsible for it,' that 'we could not be certain of a Federal Government, had the Constitution authorized or permitted slavery,' and that 'that is not government which does not promise protection, in return for allegiance.' Having thus vindicated the right and duty of the *National Government* and of *all Government*, to protect the personal liberties of its subjects, it was not difficult for the speaker to convince his hearers that the State Governments, including the Government of the State of Wisconsin has the same essential right, and that the Federal Government has no right nor Constitutional authority to prevent the exercise of that right. 'State rights'—on such a foundation, are easily understood, and may be consistently maintained. The speech of Mr. Smith is communicated to the New York Tribune, in which it will occupy over six closely printed columns—We have room only for a brief extract:

"But I must hasten to the end of my words. I said that I came here to beseech you to know no law for Slavery; but to trample under foot whatever claims to be a law for Slavery. I honor your intelligent Judiciary for declaring the Fugitive Slave Act unconstitutional. I honor Wisconsin for standing bravely by her brave Judiciary. A good and glorious example is all this. But I am here to call on you for a still better and more glorious example, Wisconsin—both her people and her Judges—must know no law, nor admit the possibility of any law for Slavery. A statute may be in favor of Slavery; a Constitution—even the idolized Federal Constitution—may be in favor of Slavery; but the voice of all Wisconsin must be, that Slavery is too repugnant to justice and humanity, to reason and religion, to be capable of wearing any, even the least, semblance of law.

Men of Wisconsin! you know that what I am claiming at your hands is simply your duty; and I cannot doubt that you will joyfully confess the duty. How blessed and how numerous will be the results of your faithfully discharging it!

There will then be no more fugitive slaves in Wisconsin; for the moment they shall touch your soil, they will cease to be slaves. That moment they will be transmuted from chattels into men. It follows, that there will be more prosecutions in your State for helping fugitive slaves, for you will not fail to make such prosecutions quite too perilous to be ventured upon. Your Booths and other good men will no more be harassed and plundered for having shown mercy to the helpless, outraged, innocent brethren. No more will they be made criminals for doing that which endears them to the heart of God, and of every right-minded man.

Then, too, in your shutting out the Slave Power from your State, and all law for Slavery, you will give the only honest, consistent, and effectual answer to the denial of citizenship to the black man by a portion of the Supreme Court of the United States. That denial is a perfectly logical deduction from the assumption that he is fit to be the subject of merchandise and to wear the yoke of Slavery. Hence it is utterly vain, not to say hypocritical also, for any who hold that the black man can be property, and his enslavement lawful, to arraign the justice or wisdom of this denial. For why should they who, though having the appearance of men, are in fact but fit to be cast into the category of chattels—why should they, any more than horses, be accounted fit for the dignity and honor of citizenship? No, it is the taking issue with slavery itself, and denying that it can have any right or any law—it is this which constitutes the only proper answer to the denial of citizenship to the black man."

It was in response to sentiments like these that the State Anti-Slavery Convention at Milwaukee *unanimously* adopted a series of Resolutions, among which are the following:

"That we honor and revere the Constitution and Government which our Fathers established, and we will strive to make them what they were designed to be, the charter and pledge of Freedom, and a blessing to all the people.

That the Constitution of the United States does not, either in express terms or by any just construction of its provisions, give any authority or sanction to human Slavery; that it confers upon Congress no power to pass *Fugitive Slave Acts*, to permit slavery in any Territory, or to legislate in its behalf, but that it is the right and duty of Congress to prohibit Slavery, in all Territories and places under its exclusive jurisdiction, and to protect with equal care the rights of all persons residing therein, without regard to Birth, Creed, or Color.

That is the duty of all Republican Governments to protect the Liberties of all the people from whom they require allegiance.

That we hold to the compacts of the Constitution, and obligation of the States not to refuse to return fugitives who owe service or labor in other States by the laws thereof; but that as "own" and "owe" are correlative terms, and he who does not own himself cannot owe another, there can be no service due from a chattel, and no obligation on the part of a State to return fugitive slaves.

That, as the highest Judicial Tribunal of this State has declared the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850, to be unconstitutional and void there is, therefore, no law for the reclamation of fugitive Slaves in Wisconsin, and whoever undertakes to return a fugitive into slavery is a kidnaper.

That, whoever treads the soil of Wisconsin is **FREE**, and whoever undertakes to enslave any of its inhabitants, should be visited with the severest penalties.

That the proper office and duty of government is to protect men's rights, not to subvert them; to expose and punish crime not to uphold it; and that as slavery is a crime against humanity, of the deepest dye, it can no more be constitutionalized or legalized, than theft, robbery or murder.

That the United States Supreme Court in their decision in the Dred Scott case, in denying the citizenship of the colored people and their right to protection by the Federal Government, has ignored the humanity of five millions of people, or one-sixth part of the population of the Republic, and adopted principles, which, if carried out, would introduce and perpetuate Slavery in every free State in the Union and that by denying the personality of the slaves and their right to maintain a suit of the Federal Courts, if correct, has absolved the State from all obligation to regard them as belonging to that

class of "persons" who are to be delivered up as owing service of labor.

From the tone of the Republican presses of Wisconsin, so far as we are acquainted with them, we have strong hopes that a majority of the Republicans in Wisconsin will approvingly respond to the sentiments of these Resolutions. Should they do so, and, should the Republicans of the other Western States follow their example, the Republican party might be brought to occupy a position in better harmony with the name of Republican than they have hitherto done.

MOVING IN OHIO.

From the Political Abolitionist. Bryan (O.)

"Is not this an auspicious time for the Abolitionists of Ohio to organize? Would it not be well to call a State Convention at as early a day as possible—have Hon GERRIT SMITH, and others, to come and speak for us, and then nominate a full State Ticket?—We are decidedly in favor of such a movement. Who seconds the motion?—What say you, Mr. Reformer? What say you, Messrs Abolitionists? Will it, and the thing can be done! It is clear that it should be done. Let us hear from you through the *Reformer*, Ravenna, Ohio, or the *Abolitionist*, at as early a day as possible; as there is no time to lose. There is no use in waiting on the Republican party of Ohio to take such ground. It will never do it so long as its prospect for office is as good as at present. The true policy is, do right and let the consequences take care of themselves."

H.

MOVEMENTS IN ILLINOIS.

We copy the following from the 'Republican,' published at Mt. Carroll, (Ill.)

4TH OF JULY CELEBRATION AT OTTER CREEK.—The inhabitants of Otter Creek and vicinity convened at the Otter Creek School House, and organized by appointing A. Goodell, Chairman, and Luther De Wolf, Secretary. The meeting was opened by prayer, after which the declaration of Independence was read, and followed by an address by Melancthon B. Williams, of New York State, on the principles of the Declaration of Independence, after which the following resolutions were adopted:

Resolved, 1st. That neither the Bible nor the Declaration of Independence, nor the Constitution of the United States uphold that worst of all despots—Domestic Slavery.

2d. That the Government of the United States ought to be administered as a Republican Government, not as a slaveholding despotism.

3d. That it is the duty of the House of Representatives to impeach Chief Justice Taney and his four associates.

4th. That if Congress has a constitutional right to uphold the slavery of negroes in the District of Columbia, it has also a constitutional right to uphold the enslaving of white men there.

5th. That all laws requiring the rendition of fugitive slaves are unconstitutional, tyrannical, barbarous and impious, and our duty to God and men requires us to treat them as the Hebrew midwives treated the comparatively mild edict of Pharaoh commanding them to murder all the male infants of the Israelites.

6th. That it is as evident that Congress has constitutional power to suppress the domestic slave trade as that they have constitutional power to suppress the foreign slave trade.

7th. That, although the foreign slave trade has been abolished on paper almost half a century, it has never been abolished in practice; and it is certain this it never can be suppressed so long as slavery continues to be practiced under the shield of State authority.

8th. That every human being in the United States has a constitutional right to worship Jehovah without let or hindrance from any man, and therefore has a constitutional right to personal liberty, without which the rights of conscience cannot be legally possessed.

9th. That all the people of the United States, the slaves included, have a constitutional right to be represented in the Congress of the United States (vide art. 1, sec. 2, cl. 3.) Therefore, they have a constitutional right to personal liberty.

10th. That every man in the United States has a con-

stitutional right to the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus, and this is a privilege which effectually protects its possessor from slavery.

11th. That slavery is incompatible with "domestic tranquility and the general welfare," being necessarily destructive of industry, of education, of the public morals, yea, of personal and national safety: Therefore the constitution of the United States (vide preamble) demands the suppression of slavery.

12th. That as in every exercise of the elective franchise for Government officers, we necessarily exert a powerful influence for or against human rights, it becomes us to look well to the principles and character of our candidates for office.

13. That the proceedings of this meeting be published in the *Carroll County Republican*.

LUTHER DE WOLF, Sec. A. GOODELL,
Chairman.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE U. S. NOT A PRO-SLAVERY INSTRUMENT.

Did Slavery exist "by due process of law" before the Revolution? Was not Slavery contrary to the laws of England? It existed in the Colonies only by absolute despotism and usurpation. What provision is there in the Constitution authorizing Slavery? Does the Constitution impair the obligation of the Contract and the Agreement entered into by the People of the Confederated Colonies, (States,) on the fourth day of July, 1776, when they pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor in defence of the principles of the Declaration of Independence?

How could men denying the propertyship of man, form or ratify a constitution that would perpetuate Slavery? Did not Franklin, Jefferson, P. Henry, S. Adams, J. Adams, Hancock and Madison, "desire to see Slavery abolished by law"?

Did not the fathers of this Republic, and the framers of the Constitution declare their intentions to be, to create a government that would be a *living example of Freedom*—"that all the unfortunate of the human race might find a solace and a shelter, under the interminable shade of its generous tree of Liberty"?

Was it not "that this Government might become a refuge for the oppressed and a terror to oppressors" that brought the friends of Liberty to our aid, the generous Lafayette and his generous compatriots?

Was the Liberty Party in the Convention less careful than the Pro-Slavery Party?

Does the Constitution *sanction* Slavery by fixing a rule of taxing and representation? If "all other persons" are not *aliens*, perhaps they are women. The Constitution secures life, liberty, and "property" to every subject of the General Government. Congress, States, or individuals cannot deprive any of them of these inalienable rights, but by due process of LAW.

Congress has power to establish a uniform rule of naturalization; but to Congress was delegated no power to deprive one of his birthright of being a *citizen* of the United States. Congress could not, prior to 1808, prohibit the importation or migration of such persons as any of the States, then existing, should think proper to admit. But could not Congress prohibit the importation of any "property" dangerous to the general welfare? Does the allowing of importation of persons sanction Slavery? Congress prohibited the importation of *slaves* into the Mississippi Territory prior to 1808. (Why?)

The States might wish to import persons for the sake of population, which might not always be for the general welfare. (The Know Nothings now call for a prohibition.) Has Congress ever passed a law making passengers of "African descent" slaves on landing on our coasts? Persons landing from abroad were legally free before 1808. There were no laws on the seas making *men* merchandise. The seas were ever *free*—free from the local laws of any *Slave State*. Like the soil of England, *free*. Men on the ocean are legally freemen, and arrive as freemen at our shores. Congress alone can regulate their naturalization.

Congress alone can regulate commerce, and the importation of goods and passengers. Can Congress deprive Africans of their property, except for public use and for just compensation? If Congress could not prohibit the *migration* of persons before 1808, then the first Fugitive Slave Law was unconstitutional. Do not Captain Ingraham, Mr. Marcy and President Pierce understand the Constitution thus, that when the laws of any State become oppressive to individuals, they may migrate? If the laws are not oppressive they certainly can. If, as the Supreme Court decided, that New York could not tax passengers, what right has Georgia ever had to enslave them, prior to 1808 or since.

Can the Mayor of Richmond regulate commerce? Can Virginia close her ports against French or African vessels? Can she flog or imprison their owners or crews for peaceably coming on shore?

"Persons held to service or labor by the laws of one State escaping into another, shall not, by any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up on the claim of the person to whom such service or labor may be due." The States, individually, cannot discharge, but cannot Congress make regulations for the general welfare? Cannot our home born unfortunates find room under our great shield of Liberty, where the Austrian outcasts and Polish serfs are sheltered?

Congress has power to make manstealing or holding to be *felony*. Congress has as much power to legislate about Slavery in the States as on the high seas. Congress has power to insist on a Republican form of government in each of the States. Congress has power to provide for the general welfare, to establish a uniform rule of naturalization, to secure to persons of African descent the exclusive use of their own writing and discoveries, (if a slave should write his own history or his master's)

Congress has power to define offences against the law of nations. (Slavery on the seas, piracy; on land, a Divine institution!) Congress has power to exercise exclusive legislation for the District of Columbia, and to make all needful regulations for the Territories. But no power was given to Congress to deprive one of his liberty or property but by due process of law.

The extradition of persons held to service was a provision for the *States only*, not for the District of Columbia or Territories. Our fathers did not consider the Declaration of Independence a mere fanfaronade of nonsense—they left no power anywhere for the institution

of Slavery in the District of Columbia or Territories. Congress or States can grant no title of nobility. (Does the Constitution allow the substance without the title?) The privilege of the writ of Habeas Corpus cannot be withheld from any person or subject of the United States.

The Constitution guarantees to every State in the Union a Republican form of government. For whom was the guarantee? Was it not for the oppressed minority? Their only safeguard? Absolute despotism is not a Republican form of government. Resistance to absolute despotism is not resistance to the legitimate form of government, but obedience to God. Absolute despotism and usurpation are rebellion against the Constitution of the United States.

The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of the citizens of the several States, any thing in the Constitution, or law, or police regulation of any State to the contrary, notwithstanding. If a Slave State can imprison citizens of Vermont, cannot Vermont imprison slaveholders? If a black must prove his freedom, why should not a white be required to prove his pedigree? Should Governor Wise go to South Carolina in search for his slave, could not South Carolina require him to show his free papers; and if he could not, would he not be imprisoned and sold for his jail fees?

Maugre the Ordinance of '89 or Missouri Compromise, Slavery could not exist in the Territories. The Territories could not institute Slavery, and slaves become free as soon as out of their State.

Does not Mr. Phillips' book of Madison papers prove the contrary of Mr. Phillips' doctrine?

W. C.

THE AMERICAN TRACT SOCIETY, it would seem, is still under the direction of those who are intent on preserving the favor of its slaveholding members and patrons. The tract of "C. K. W." which had received the approbation of Dr. Brown, of Edinburgh, and Drs. Wayland and Clark, of Providence, had been offered to the Tract Committee, by Dr. J. P. Thompson, of New-York, with the strongest confidence that they would publish it. But he was disappointed. Not only so. In order to allay the needless alarm of the slaveholders, at the action taken at the last Anniversary, the Secretaries of the Society, without any authority from the Committee, felt "called upon, in the Providence of God" to address a circular letter "to Evangelical Christians, and especially to the Society's Colporteurs, Superintendents, and General Agents, and to Editors of the Religious Press throughout our Southern and South-Western States" in order to correct "misapprehensions," and to assure them that no change, or none of any importance, had taken place, in the policy of the Society. The Northern Editors and Members were not favored with the document, but learned its existence and character only from the Southern and South-Western papers! This course the N. Y. Independent reproves, and anticipates, in respect to this matter, and the suppression of the Anti-Slavery Tract, a thorough overhauling at the next Annual Meeting of the Society. What adroit dodge will then be resorted to, remains to be

seen. But if the Anti-Slavery portion and patrons of the Society do not mean to be perpetually gulled, or to become partners in the ruse, they must either make a radical revolution in the Society, in its administration and measures, or abandon it altogether, and seek some other means of circulating Evangelical Books and Tracts.

THE DECISION IN OHIO.

Judge Leavitt, after grave deliberation of weeks, has finally decided the question as everybody knew he would, by the discharge of the Fugitive Slave Law officials. And our State officers are relieved from all necessity of traitorous collision with the federal government, by quietly and gracefully submitting to this decision—the supreme law of the land. Our Republican authorities gravely resolved last winter to punish all kidnappers except such as kidnap by United States authority, a principle in which Judge Leavitt cordially coincides, and quotes Republican authority to maintain it, namely, Judge McLean's decision in the Rosetta Armstead case. A decision which was this same Judge Leavitt's authority, for two or three similar decisions in the Margaret Garner case. It is rather wonderful that in the barrenness of the law books in furnishing precedents for his purpose, Judge Leavitt has not quoted these decisions of his own. They were precisely in point.

But the question is settled, and we shall hear nothing more of resistance to it from State authorities.—*Anti-Slavery Bugle*.

From this, the "Bugle" proceeds to argue the necessity of a dissolution of the Union. We see in it an argument for the national abolition of slavery. It is Slavery, not the Union, that does the mischief. It is abolition, not disunion, that the slave wants—that humanity demands. It is the "deliverance of the oppressed" that God, and Nature, and the Bible demand at our hands—not their delivery into the hands of their tyrants, either by the "Judge Leavitt" process, nor by that of "hands off"—let the two races fight it out."

IGNORANCE OF THE CONSTITUTION.

Frederick Douglass's paper tells the following story of a colloquy between the writer and a "Democrat."

"During the last Presidential campaign, the writer when at Marcellus, New York, came in contact with a Democrat of the new school, an old man who felt the burden of sixty years upon him. In the course of conversation, the writer remarked, that in the city of Boston resided colored Attorneys, and Magistrates, that colored men voted as white men did, precisely upon the same conditions. 'You will allow me to correct you there, sir,' said our venerable friend, 'such a state of things cannot exist in any State of this Union, with our present Constitution.' We replied; 'Does the Constitution of the United States make any distinction between white men and black men?'

"Certainly, it does," he answered, "I am really surprised at you."

"Where, point out the clause if you please?" "O, on most every page. Why the Fugitive Slave Law ought to convince you of that.—Read that;" said he, triumphantly.

"I cannot find it, sir, in the Constitution." "Then, you have read it to no purpose, and I would advise you to examine it a little more carefully. I have read it often. If I had a copy I could show it to you in a minute or two."

"I happen to have one sir," we replied, handing it to him, with the request that he would find it. He soon found the clause relating to "persons held to service or labor." We tried to convince him that in that clause, there was no legal definition of a slave. "But," said he, "I always thought it said 'slave' 'right out.'—"But stop," said he, "let me look at the copy again. O, that's an Abolition copy: no wonder you can't find any thing about fugitive slaves and black people in that. GERRIT SMITH got that up, I know."

"O yes!" said we; "this is an Abolition copy; and you will find that every copy in the country is an Abolition copy."

He was confident, however, that his was different. He could find the words "black" man and "slaves" in his.

Now there are many men who know no more about the Constitution than he."

The case of the "Democrat" at Marcellus was not a singular one. More than one-half of our voting citizens have never read the Constitution in their lives, nor have they a copy in their possession. It was to supply this destitution, that the American Abolition Society has published "Our National Charters," containing not only the "Federal Constitution," but the previous "Articles of Confederation," the "Declaration of Independence," and the still previous "Articles of Association," by which "the Union" was formed in 1774. (See Notice in another column.)

AFFAIRS OF KANSAS.

For some time past, and until within a few days, there has been a very general impression that Kansas was in a pretty fair way to gain admission, as a free State, without the recurrence of any of those scenes of bloodshed and disorganization, by which her history has formerly been distinguished. But another dark cloud has come over her prospects. The continued Federal recognition of the bogus Border Ruffian Legislature and its black code is, we fear, no longer to remain a dead letter, as had fondly been hoped. The apparently conciliatory course of Gov. Walker had alarmed and exasperated the slaveholding oligarchy. Especially were they indignant at the promise that the new Constitution about to be framed by the bogus Convention, elected by a lean minority of the people, should afterwards be submitted to the people at large, for their adoption or rejection.

Not only Governor Walker, but President Buchanan and his administration have for this offence, come under the malediction of the fire eaters. The old Democratic party itself has been threatened with extinction. A new pro-slavery party was to be formed that could be depended upon. Such has been the tone of their leading journals and public meetings. The President, the Cabinet, and Gov. Walker appear to have been thus bullied into subjection. Their previous and very natural solicitude to pacify the North, and so preserve the Democratic party by preserving the little northern remnant of it, seems to have been overborne by the new alternative thus presented to them. The bulk of the Democratic party is found in the South, and must control its policy, even at its own destruction, if need be. That destruction, should it come, would only leave the oligarchy at leisure to construct their threatening new party afterwards. And their reliance on the servile remnant of the northern Democracy leaves them the hope that the necessity will not come.

The ostensible occasion seized upon, by Governor Walker, for this new demonstration, far as we have been able to ascertain, is, substantially, this. The city of Lawrence has proceeded to organize a city government, under the authority of a charter of their own forming which 'differs intentionally, in many essential particulars,' from the bogus Charter said to have been imposed upon them by the Misso-

invaders. This is regarded by Governor Walker, as 'treason' against the Federal Government, by whom the authority of the said invaders over the Territory had been recognized. But the real difficulty evidently is, that the citizens of Lawrence, in organizing their city government, were preparing to co-operate with their fellow-citizens elsewhere, throughout the Territory, to sustain the Topeka Constitution, by submitting it to the people, at the August election. All this is evident from the Proclamation of Governor Walker, in which, at the head of his Federal troops, he accuses them of 'urging other localities to a similar course,' charges them with treason, threatens them with subjugation, and throws upon them the responsibility and the blame of civil war, unless they unconditionally submit to the authority of the Missourian invaders, and the sham government instituted by them.

All this is in a fair way to furnish another illustration of the folly of attempting or of expecting any such thing as a National Administration that shall be neutral—that shall hold an even and impartial balance between *Slavery*, on the one side, and *Freedom* on the other, allowing to each a fair chance of gaining the ascendancy, and only confirming the decision, whatever it may be. It need excite no surprise that not even the cautious and 'facile' Buchanan could maintain any such ground. Those qualities would indeed forbid it, if the thing itself were possible, as we think it is not. But it will surprise some, who are not as well posted up in political matters as they should be, that a leading journal of the late Fremont campaign, whose editor was the chief penman of the Pittsburgh Address,* that defined the position upon which the Nominating Convention at Philadelphia was invited, should now be found by the side of President Buchanan and Governor Walker, on this issue. But so it is. We are not speaking of James Gordon Bennett and his New York Herald, at whose position no one should wonder. The following is from an editorial in the New York Daily Times, of July 22.

"We have never been able to see that any possible result of permanent good for Kansas or the nation were to be achieved by the attitude of the Free State men at Topeka."

It is impossible that any man of common loyalty and common sense, occupying the position of a Federal officer in Kansas, should look quietly on upon such an absolute and contemptuous disregard of his authority, and of the very existence of the Government which he represents, as is manifested by the citizens of Lawrence in their municipal organization."

The friends of freedom have been pained, for some time past, by the policy of the New York Times in supporting or half-supporting the course of the Administration and of Governor Walker, in respect to Kansas. But so long as there seemed to be some excuse for giving credit to the fair professions and profuse promises of the President and his Governor, we were charitably disposed to credit the Times with more misplaced confidence than sagacity in the matter. But what shall we say now? The Federal Administration in Kansas openly aban-

* We here allude to MR. H. J. RAYMOND, who was the Republican Lieutenant-Governor of New York, under Governor Clark. Mr. Raymond, we learn, is now in Europe, but his friends, we presume, would not claim for him, that his presence here, at this crisis, would very essentially modify the editorial position of 'the Times.'

dons its fair show of allowing a free ballot in Kansas. It denounces the first attempt to prepare for a free vote on the Constitution to be treasonable! And the New York Times, instead of withdrawing its misplaced confidence in the Administration and its Governor, joins with them in raising the hue and cry of 'treason' against the free State men in Kansas for daring to make preparations for that exercise of free suffrage that had been promised to them. Will the friends of freedom never cease to run after political quacks and pretenders, instead of supporting tried and trusty men?

THE NEW YORK HERALD, (July 23) is much gratified that the Republican members of the New Hampshire Legislature 'at a full Convention' have resolved to re-nominate Col. Fremont for the Presidency, for 1860, but is greatly scandalized at their having made this nomination, not only upon 'the platform of the principles adopted by the Philadelphia Convention,' but also upon the 'Resolutions of the New Hampshire Legislature in relation to the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the case of Dred Scott' condemnatory of the same. This additional appendage the Herald holds to be heretical, tending 'to place Col. Fremont in a false position before the country,' as 'a party candidate nominated upon nullification principles'—'the candidate of a sectional agitation party of the pure Seward stripe.'—The Herald insists that Fremont was not indebted to the Philadelphia Republican Convention for his tremendous popular vote. Seward was the man they desired, but they gave way to the popular pressure.—The Herald advises 'the conservative Union, and peace-loving friends of Colonel Fremont to beware of the movements of the Seward black Republicans.'

FROM AN AGED MINISTER.

In these days of compromise and servility, it is refreshing to get a line, now and then, from an old-fashioned New England minister, who has not lost the spirit of the Puritans and of the Revolution. The following extract is from a venerable survivor of the race of Bellamy, Edwards, Hopkins, and Emmons, whose orthodoxy and abolitionism went together.

'*East Hardwick, Vt., July 14, 1857.*

'Mr. Goodell—My Dear Sir: Your last Radical is so good, I must have a finger in the pie. I love to find men that fear God, have moral principles, and dare to avow them. How many compromisers will ever wear the martyr's crown?

'The church in New York to which Dr. Cheever ministers have done nobly in supporting him. God will bless them. But woe to those in the church, or on a throne, who dare put forth their hand against the Lord's anointed, Christ will take care of his faithful servants, and, in that dreadful hour, when the heavens are passing away, will say to all their oppressors, "Inasmuch as ye did it not to these my brethren, ye did it not to me."

'Saints should not fear, but stand forth as bold as lions, and drive the wicked into corners. The armies must meet in a death struggle. Christ and those that follow him are ready. Let all the combined hosts of the enemy prepare, and come down to the valley of Jehosha-

phat as soon as they please. They will find the Lord is there. See Joel iii. 1—17.

Hilton Rowan Helper, of North Carolina. Ah! that is the man! I thank you for placing him before your readers. I like his name, the work he proposes, and the method by which he intends to break the cruel yoke of slavery from the neck of millions, who are in a state of degradation and wickedness, which should not be tolerated. Millions of our own race and their children are crushed under the iron heel of slavery and held there from generation to generation by the haughty slaveocracy of the South, that they may crush another race, rot in idleness, raise a worthless race, to curse our land, and provoke God to pour out the vials of his wrath upon our whole land. Who can survey the sand-hills in South Carolina, with their degraded population, hear the wail from millions of the non-slaveholders, and see them in their wretched cabins, and not cry out—"How long, O Lord, Holy, and just, ere thou arise to execute vengeance upon all who rob their fellow-men, and tread upon the poor, whatever may be their color?"

I am too feeble to help and can only cheer you on, and rejoice in your success. Think of the poor sandhillers and their families—must all such perish, and none help? Why send the gospel into Africa and neglect them in America?

I rejoice that you can work, and hope it will not be in vain.

Yours, cordially,

KIAH BAYLEY.

FROM INDIANA.

[Extract of a Letter.]

You have probably seen a notice from the Louisville Democrat going the rounds, stating that REV. ELIJAH ANDERSON, of Madison, Indiana, has lately been convicted of running off slaves, and sentenced to the penitentiary for eight years. Now, the truth is that Anderson is not a preacher, not a resident of Madison, but of Ohio, and was wholly innocent of the charge. He was betrayed by a colored preacher of the same name, who under false pretences beguiled him from his home and delivered him to the Kentuckians in order to secure himself. Such I presume is the origin of the story. The wife of the innocent man was here, not long since, soliciting funds to bail her husband. If, as everything would indicate, the paragraph mentioned refers to him, we see the result. The annals even of our domestic despotism, seldom record a more monstrous outrage. I think the anti-slavery papers should notice it as it deserves.

Respectfully yours,

J. H. JULIAN.

PICTURES OF SLAVERY in Church and State, including personal reminiscences, biographical sketches, anecdotes, etc. with an appendix containing the views of John Wesley and Richard Watson on slavery. By REV. JOHN DIXON LONG, a superannuated Minister of the Philadelphia Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Philadelphia; published by the author, 1857. pp. 410.

The author is a native of Maryland, and his father was a slaveholder.—He was born in 1817, was received into the M. E. Church in 1835, and commenced his ministerial career in 1839. In 1848 his health failed, and in 1856 he removed to Philadelphia. His opportunity of witnessing

RADICAL ABOLITIONIST.

slavery within the bounds of the 'Philadelphia Conference (which, it seems, embraces portions of Maryland and Delaware) were extensive, and his collections of facts and anecdotes illustrating its character is valuable. Not a few of them illustrate the effects of slavery upon slaveholding professors of religion, and the connection of the M. E. Church with that abominable system. On his removal to Philadelphia, he was surprised and grieved at the position and course of Philadelphia Methodists, on that subject. The book is peculiarly a readable one to those whose leisure is scanty; as the anecdotes are brief, under separate heads, and disconnected with any long narrative. As a scrap-book of isolated facts on the subject, it is unrivalled.

The Boston *Law Reporter* contends that the Supreme Court has not decided the question whether a free negro is a citizen of the United States. According to that journal, three judges decide in the negative on that question, three in the affirmative, and three are silent. Also, that it has not decided the Missouri Compromise unconstitutional; nor that a master may take his slave into a free State, and there hold him as a slave; but that if a slave when taken to a free State does not there claim his liberty and consents to return with his master, it depends upon the law of the State from which he is taken and to which he is returned whether he is free or not.—*F. Douglass' paper.*

If the lawyers can make out this, from the official Document, we have no objection. Whatever decision was made by the pro-slavery judges, it can be *unmade*, and will be, if the people desire it, earnestly enough to put the National Administration into the hands of those who will administer the Constitution in harmony with its preamble.

Slavery is an inexorable master and proceeds logically to the consummation of its purpose. It allows no compromise, and those who do not endorse its policy to the fullest extent, are counted among its enemies. Would it not be well for the friends of Freedom to learn from its opponent, and while allowing perfect toleration, reduce the contest to a struggle between the absolute right and the absolute wrong?—*Kansas News.*

FATE OF THE 'LIMITATION' POLICY.

The course of events, as the Dred Scott decision, the progress of matters respecting Kansas &c., appear to have already decided the controversy in respect to any limitation of slavery by act of Congress, so long as slavery exists in the old States. Whatever else may be done, that will not be done.

As a 'political issue' on the approach of a Presidential election, that question we venture to predict, will never come up again.—If Kansas becomes a free State, it will not be in consequence of any action of Congress requiring it to be a free State. The most that the Free State men in Kansas, or the Republican party of the country now asks for, or expect, is, that (as in the California struggle) the State at its own request, may be allowed admittance without slavery.

The 'limitation' policy, as a political issue, having thus become obsolete, will not its advocates rally on the issue of abolition—the only issue that is worth anything, or that has vitality and significance enough, to rouse the energies of a free people?

GENERAL CATALOGUE OF BOOKS
PAMPHLETS, &c.

For sale at the Abolition Depository, 48 Beekman St. New York. Terms Cash.

Those who send money for books to be sent by mail, will please add the postage. Orders to be addressed to "William Goodell, 48 Beekman Street N. Y."

BOOKS.

	Wholesale.	Retail.	Postage.
American Slave Code, by William Goodell	\$ 50	8 75	17
Autographs for Freedom	63	1 00	12
Autobiography of a Female Slave	67	1 00	17
Belle Scott, or Liberty overthrown	75	1 00	21
Browning, Walter, or the Slave's Protector	16	20	5
Burns, Anthony	56	75	17
Bible Servitude—E Smith of Ohio	40	50	10
Barnes on Slavery	40	50	15
Brisbane " In Cloth	31	38	5
" " Paper	18	25	4
Chaplet The—by E H C	25	38	8
Congregationalism and Church Action—by John Kepp	18	25	4
Colored Patriots of the Am. Revolution	85	1 00	18
Dred, a Tale of the Great Dismal Swamp: By Harriet Beecher Stowe, in 2 vols.	1 17	1 75	36
Democracy of Christianity, by Wm. Goodell in two vols.	1 00	1 50	82
Evidence on the Slave Trade	22	25	6
Facts for Baptist Churches	56	75	12
Breeman's (O. S.) Letters on Slavery, a very valuable work	28	38	5
" " in paper	20	25	3
Gospel Fruits—a premium Essay—by Mrs. Maria Goodell Frost	31	35	7
Grosvenor's Review of Fuller and Wayland	25	37	6
Gertrude Lee, or the Northern Cousin	20	25	5
God against Slavery	60	75	15
Harriet and Ellen, or the Orphan Girls	20	25	5
Home in the South	20	25	5
Higher Law—by Wm. Hosmer, with Portrait of Ex Gov Seward	40	50	10
Jay's Miscellaneous Writings, containing Judge Jay's principal Anti-Slavery Works*	75	1 00	27
Journey through Texas—Olmstead	88	1 25	26
Key to Uncle Tom's Cabin in cloth	60	75	20
" " paper	40	50	14
Law and Government—By Harmon Kingsbury	38	50	10
Letters on Africa, by Geo Thompson	27	30	6
Legion of Liberty	40	50	13
My Bondage and My Freedom—F. Douglass	75	1 25	19
Memoir of Levi Spencer, by J Blanchard	22	25	6
North and South	40	50	9
Phelps' Letters to Stowe and Bacon	28	38	9
Proceedings of Anti Slavery Convention 1841 & 43	39	50	1
Review of the Mexican War, by Jay	56	75	18
Seaboard Slave States—Olmstead	88	1 25	5
Smith, Gerrit, in Congress	56	80	16
Struggle for Slavery Extension or Restriction in the U. S.—Horace Greeley	35	50	8
Slave Trade—Domestic and Foreign—By H C Carey	75	1 00	15
Slavery and Anti Slav, History of—By Goodell	75	1 00	30
Tribute for the Negro. Vindication of their Moral, Intellectual, and Religious Capabilities	80	1 00	38
The Kidnapped and the Ransomed, or Forty Years in Slavery	75	1 25	19
Twelve Years in Slavery, the Narrative of Solomon Northrop	67	1 00	17
The Harp of Freedom—Geo. W. Clark	75	1 00	16
Unconstitutionality of Slavery—Spooner	56	75	12

PAMPHLETS.

Abolition Documents No. 2 per hundred.	1 00	1 pr. oz	
do " 3 do	50	"	
do " 4 do	1 50	"	
Amanda—A Tale by Dr Brisbane	6	10	2
American Slavery, a formidable obstacle to the conversion of the World—Prize Es say by Wm Goodell	3	6	1
American Slavery and American Christianity containing Dr Perkins' Sermon, Jay on Tract Society, Jay on American Missionary Association, and Letter on Dropping a Book from the Catalogue of the American Sunday School Union	6	10	2
Am. Tract Soc. Apologies, Review of	4	5	2
Anti Slavery Manual—By John G Fee	15	25	5
Black Code of District of Columbia	19	25	3
Calumny refuted by Facts from Liberia	5	7	1
Cassius M Clay's Appeal to Christians	1-2	1	1
Caukin's Narrative	3	5	1
Christian's Business—By Geo Thompson, of Africa	2	3	1
Conditions of Living—By James C Jackson	1-2	1	1
Constitutional Duty of the Federal Government to abolish Slavery,	2	2	1
Const'n. U. S. with a Lecture by D. Foster	8	10	3
Cons. of U. S. vs. Slavery pr. hundred	1 00	1 pr. oz	
Constitution of the U. S.—All the Acts of Congress relating to Slavery, &c.	9	15	2
Documents—Fugitive Slave Bill, &c. &c. &c.	1	2	1
Edmundson Family—Harriet B. Stowe	9	12	..
Facts and Duties of the Times—G. W. Perkins	3	6	1
Facts and Opinions on Colonization Society; its Real Origin, Character and Influence	31	37	1
Facts in Life of Gen. Taylor	4	6	1
" Fanatic"—Perils of Peter Plant	6	10	2
Free Mission Principle—By Edwin R Warren	2	3	1
Fugitive Slave Law—By Rev Joseph P. Thompson	6	8	2
Granger's Speech on the Constitution	1	2	1
Great Issue—History of Free Soil Question	6	10	6
Headlands in Life of Henry Clay	1	2	1
History of Division in Anti Slavery Societies	4	6	1
Holley (Myron) History or Monument	4	6	1
Kansas Struggle of 1856 in Congress, and in the Presidential Campaign	10	1	1
Law versus Slavery 50cts per hundred	1	1	1
Liberty Tracts—per hundred	25	6	1
Life of Lovejoy	28	37	9
Mosaic Laws of Servitude—By Judge Jay	8	12	3

* In the *National Era*, the price was advertised somewhat lower, but considering the size and value of the book, it cannot be afforded less than these prices.

Our National Charters (Constitution, &c.)	6	12	3
Paper presented to General Anti Slavery Convention	1	1	1
Parker and Bood's Discussion	18	25	4
Platforms The. of Political Parties	1	2	1
Politics and the Pulpit, from Journal of Commerce and Independent	7	10	2
Remonstrance of Evangelical Alliance	4	6	1
Remedy for Duelling	1	2	1
Reproof of the American Church—By Bishop of Oxford	6	10	3
Report of Committee of Congregational Ministers of Mass.	3	6	1
" of Am. & For. Anti Slavery Society for 1847, & 52	8	12	2
" " " for 1849-50-51 & 53	18	25	3
Reviewer Reviewed—By Chas G Finney	6	10	3
Sabbath Scene—By Whitt			